



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,052	01/26/2000	Jin-Soo JEONG	P992070	9396

33942 7590 08/21/2003

CHA & REITER  
411 HACKENSACK AVE, 9TH FLOOR  
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

GARY, ERIKA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2681

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/492,052	JEONG, JIN-SOO
Examiner	Art Unit	
Erika A. Gary	2681	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_. 
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_. 
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_. 

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_. 

Claim(s) rejected: 1-16. 

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. 

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_. 
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_. 

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The Examiner holds that Kazmi discloses the limitations of claim 2 [see col. 7: lines 13-25] which have now been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 11. Kazmi's MSC corresponds to the functionality of the BSC in the present invention and Kazmi's HLR corresponds to the functionality of the MSC in the present invention. It is well known in the art that functions of the BSC can be performed by the MSC as they are sometimes implemented as one unit and likewise for the HLR and MSC. Applicant argues this notion of equivalents as Kazmi shows an MSC and BSC in figure 1. However, the cited portions of Kazmi relied upon by the Examiner are related to figure 8, which only shows an MSC and HLR.

  
ERIKA GARY  
PATENT EXAMINER

703-308-0123